IN THE DRAWINGS:

Figure 1 has been amended as shown on the replacement sheet attached hereto.

R E M A R K S

In the Office Action dated October 20, 2005, the Examiner noted a need to change the legend "parameters/parameters" in Figure 1 to --parameter/parameters-- which has done in Figure 1 on the replacement sheet attached hereto.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Wu et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Independent claims 1 and 11 as originally filed stated that measured signals are obtained from an examination subject that are processed to obtain image data, the image data forming at least one image for use in making a diagnosis relative to the examination subject. Claims 1 and 11 as originally filed further stated that a diagnosis-specific parameter is set, representing a criterion for image quality of the image. The aforementioned image is automatically electronically analyzed to determine whether it has an image quality that satisfies the parameter, and if so, the acquisition of the measured signals is ended and if not, the acquisition continues until an image having an image quality that satisfies the parameter is obtained.

By stating in the original language of claims 1 and 11 that the image is for use in making a diagnosis relative to the examination subject, the "at least one image" set forth in claims 1 and 11 was intended to mean an image that is in a suitable form for making such a diagnosis, i.e., an image that can be viewed by a physician for that purpose. Therefore, a raw data image or an "image" in a k-space matrix, or an image in any form that cannot be reviewed for the purpose of making a diagnosis does not constitute an image of the type claimed in original claims 1 and 11. Moreover, the "diagnosis-specific parameter" set forth in original claims 1 and 11

-11-

was intended to mean a parameter that is set dependent on the aforementioned diagnosis that is to be made.

Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to make these features more explicit, to refer to the image throughout the claims as being a "diagnostic image" for review to make a diagnosis, and the aforementioned parameter has been claimed as being a parameter that is specific to *said* diagnosis, so that the parameter is specifically related to the diagnosis that is to be made on the basis of the aforementioned diagnostic image.

Changes in the respective sets of dependent claims have been made to make those claims consistent with the amended independent claims.

By contrast, in the Wu et al. reference, the magnetic resonance signals are received and demodulated so as to obtain raw data, and a pair of correction factors are applied to the *raw data*. These correction factors are for the purpose of (ultimately) reducing ghost artifacts in the actual diagnostic image that will be subsequently generated from the raw data, but in the Wu et al. reference it is not the image quality of the actual diagnostic image that is analyzed, but instead the correction factors are derived from the underlying image data for the purpose of improving the processing of the raw data. This is summarized in the Wu et al. reference at column 2, lines 48-65.

Moreover, the correction factors are not predetermined, but are adaptively or dynamically generated in an iterative process, and thus change (or can change) in each iteration. The correction factors therefore do not represent a predetermined parameter, as explicitly required in claims 1 and 11.

Moreover, the correction factors, as noted above, are for the purpose of altering the image processing of the raw data for the purpose of eliminating or reducing ghost artifacts in the final image. The correction factors, therefore, have nothing to do with the type of diagnosis that will be made using the diagnostic image. The correction factors in the Wu et al. reference, therefore, are not "diagnosis-specific" as required in original claims 1 and 11, and are not based on "*said diagnosis*" as required in amended claims 1 and 11.

These differences are further highlighted in dependent claims 7 and 17, wherein, in addition to the aforementioned analysis based on the image quality of the diagnostic image, a further parameter is set that is related to the image data *signals*. This further parameter based on the image data signals might correspond more closely to the correction parameters that are derived from the image data in the Wu et al. reference, however, this further parameter is used *in addition to* the aforementioned parameter related to image quality. Since the further parameter based on the image data signals is explicitly set forth in dependent claims 7 and 17, this means that the parameter based on the image quality of the diagnostic image must be something other than the further parameter that is claimed in claims 7 and 17, otherwise claims 7 and 17 would simply be claiming the same thing as already claimed in independent claims 1 and 11.

The Wu et al. reference, therefore, does not disclose all of the elements of independent claims 1 and 11 as arranged and operating in those claims and therefore does not anticipate either of those independent claims. The method claims depending from independent claim 1 and the apparatus claims depending from independent claim 11 add further method steps or further structure to the novel

method and apparatus of claims 1 and 11, and therefore none of those dependent claims is anticipated by the Wu et al. reference for the same reasons discussed above in connection with claims 1 and 11.

All claims of the application are therefore submitted to be in condition for allowance, and early reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Submitted by,

Steven H. Noll (Reg. 28,982)

SCHIFF, HARDIN LLP
CUSTOMER NO. 26574
Patent Department
6600 Sears Tower
233 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312/258-5790
Attorneys for Applicants.

CH1\ 4447197.1